



Massachusetts

Department of Correction

Quarterly Report on the Status of Prison Overcrowding, Second Quarter of 1999

**Submitted in Compliance with Chapter 799
Section 21 of the Acts of 1985**

A. Paul Cellucci
Governor

Jane Perlov
Secretary of Public Safety

Michael T. Maloney
Commissioner

Kathleen M. Dennehy
Deputy Commissioner

August, 1999

Approved by: State Purchasing Agent
Publication No: 14,602-09-45-10-10-86

1999 Second Quarter Report

Section Twenty-one of Chapter 799 of the Acts of 1985 directs the Commissioner of Correction to report quarterly on the status of overcrowding in state and county facilities. This statute calls for the following information:

Such report shall include, by facility, the average daily census for the period of the report and the actual census on the first and the last days of the report period. Said report shall also contain such information for the previous twelve months and a comparison to the rated capacity of such facility.

This report presents the required statistics for the second quarter of 1999.

This report was prepared by Hollie Matthews Hoover of the Research and Planning Division, and is based on daily count sheets prepared by the Classification Division.

1999 Second Quarter Report

Contents

Table of Contents	1
Technical Notes	2
Abbreviations	3
Table 1. Population in Department of Correction Facilities, April 1, 1999 to June 30, 1999	4
Table 2. Population in Department of Correction Facilities, April 1, 1998 to March 31, 1999	5
Table 3. Population in County Correctional Facilities by County, April 1, 1999 to June 30, 1999	6
Table 4. Population in County Correctional Facilities by Facility, April 1, 1999 to June 30, 1999	6
Table 5. Population in County Correctional Facilities by County, April 1, 1998 to March 31, 1999	7
Table 6. Population in County Correctional Facilities by Facility, April 1, 1998 to March 31, 1999	7
Figure 1. DOC Sentenced Population, Second Quarters of 1998 and 1999	8
Figure 2. HOC Population, Second Quarters of 1998 and 1999	8
Table 7. Quarterly DOC Court Commitments by Sex, 1998 and 1999	9
Figure 3. Quarterly DOC Court Commitments by Sex, 1998 and 1999	9

Technical Notes, 1996 to Present¹

- The official capacity or custody level designation for each facility can change for a number of reasons, e.g. expansion of facility beds, decrease of facility beds due to fire, or changes in contracts with vendors. In all tables the capacity and custody level reflects the status at the end of the reporting period. The design capacity is reported for correctional facilities in Tables 1 through 6.
- On November 15, 1996, one hundred new modular beds were added to MCI Concord, increasing its design capacity to 614. Ninety-six modular beds were also added to MCI Norfolk, increasing its total to 1,084 beds. Pondville Correctional Center was reclassified from Custody Level 3/2 to Custody Level 3.
- Two hundred and forty-three new modular beds were added to Middlesex (Billerica) House of Correction on November 15, 1996, increasing its total to 874 beds, and the Middlesex county total to 1,035 beds.
- Due to changes in the Massachusetts General Law, DOC consolidated one unit at the Bridgewater Treatment Center and back-filled with general population inmates. These design capacity beds were placed on-line November 8, 1996 and first appeared on the November 12, 1996 daily count sheet. Three hundred additional beds were placed on-line during the third quarter of 1997.
- Due to a DOC policy modification, the security level of MCI-Shirley (Min) was changed from Security Level 3/2 to Security Level 3 during the first quarter of 1996 .
- Where relevant, the population figures for all facilities include both male and female inmates except as shown at Lancaster.
- State inmates housed in the Hampshire County contract program are included in the county population tables, as are all other state inmates housed in county facilities.
- Longwood Treatment Center is a specialized DOC facility which houses primarily individuals incarcerated for operating under the influence of alcohol. Because the inmates are predominantly county sentenced inmates, the inmate count and bed capacity are also included in Tables 3 and 4.
- Beginning with the second quarter of 1998 quarterly report, the following county correctional facilities are presented individually: Bristol Dartmouth, Bristol Ash Street, David R. Nelson Correctional Addiction Center, and Bristol Pre-Release in Bristol County; Essex Middleton and Essex Lawrence Correctional Alternative Center in Essex County; Middlesex Cambridge and Middlesex Billerica in Middlesex County; Norfolk Braintree, Norfolk Dedham, and Norfolk Contract in Norfolk County. Beginning with the third quarter of 1998 report, facilities for Suffolk and Hampden counties are presented individually.
- Nashua Street inmates housed at other facilities are reported in the counts for the facilities in which they are in custody.
- On October 22, 1997, Eastern Massachusetts Correctional Alcohol Center (EMCAC) was renamed the David R. Nelson Correctional Addiction Center (DRNCAC).
- The Souza-Baranowski Correctional Center, a security level 6 facility, was added to the Department of Correction count sheet on November 3, 1998. The facility began housing offenders on November 6, 1998. The average daily population in Table 2 is based on the previous twelve months. Since SBCC was populated for only five of the twelve months, the figures in Table 2 for this facility are skewed.

¹ For technical notes prior to 1996, please refer to previous quarterly reports.

- On April 18, 1995, new security level designations were established according to 103 DOC 101 Correctional Institutions/Custody Levels policy which states:

Custody Levels:

- **Level One.** The least restrictive in the department and is reserved only for those inmates who are at the end of their sentence and have been identified as posing little to no threat to the community. Supervision is minimal and indirect.

- **Level Two.** A custody level in which both design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the goal of restoring to the inmate maximum responsibility and control of their own behavior and actions prior to their release. Direct supervision of these inmates is not required, but intermittent observation may be appropriate under certain conditions. Inmates within this level may be permitted to access the community unescorted to participate in programming to include, but not limited to, work release, educational release, etc.

- **Level Three.** A custody level in which both the design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the goal of returning to the inmate a greater sense of personal responsibility and autonomy while still providing for supervision and monitoring of behavior and activity. Inmates within this security level are not considered a serious risk to the safety of staff, inmates or to the public. Program participation is mandated and geared toward their potential reintegration into the community. Access to the community is limited and under constant direct staff supervision.

- **Level Four.** A custody level in which both the design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the goal of restoring to the inmate some degree of responsibility and control of their own behavior and actions, while still insuring the safety of staff and inmates. Design/construction is generally characterized by high security parameters and limited use of internal physical barriers. Inmates at this level have demonstrated the ability to abide by rules and regulations and require intermittent supervision. However, behavior in the community, i.e., criminal sentence and/or the presence of serious outstanding legal matters indicate the need for some control and for segregation from the community. Job and program opportunities exist for all inmates within the perimeter of the facility.

- **Level Five.** A custody level in which design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the need to provide maximum external and internal control and supervision of inmates. Inmates accorded to this status may present an escape risk or pose a threat to other inmates, staff, or the orderly running of the institution, however, at a lesser degree than those at level 6. Supervision remains constant and direct. Through an inmates willingness to comply with institutional rules and regulations, increased job and program opportunities exist.

- **Level Six.** A custody level in which both design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the need to provide maximum external and internal control and supervision of inmates primarily through the use of high security parameters and extensive use of internal physical barriers and check points. Inmates accorded this status present serious escape risks or pose serious threats to themselves, to other inmates, to staff, or the orderly running of the institution. Supervision of inmates is direct and constant. Inmates are confined to their cells at all times, except when they are removed for authorized activities. Inmates within their status, when removed from their cell, are typically under escort and in restraints.

Abbreviations

AC	- Addiction Center	OSCC	- Old Colony Correctional Center
ADP	- Average Daily Population	OUI	- Operating Under the Influence
ATU	- Awaiting Trial Unit	PPREP	- Pre-Parole Residential Environmental Phase Program
CRS	- Contract Residential Services Includes Charlotte House, and Houston House	PRC	- Pre-Release Center
DDU	- Departmental Disciplinary Unit	SBCC	- Souza-Baranowski Correctional Center
DOC	- Department of Correction	SECC	- Southeastern Correctional Center
DRNCAC	David R. Nelson Correctional Addiction Center	SDPTC	- Sexually Dangerous Person Treatment Center
DSU	- Departmental Segregation Unit	SMCC	- South Middlesex Correctional Center (formerly SMPRC)
HOC	- House of Correction	SH	- State Hospital
LCAC	- Lawrence Correctional Alternative Center	TC	- Treatment Center (Longwood)
NECC	- Northeastern Correctional Center		
NCCI	- North Central Correctional Institution at Gardner		

Table 1 provides the DOC figures for the second quarter of 1999. As this table indicates, the DOC population (excluding Bridgewater SH, SDPTC, AC, Longwood TC, and county inmates at the Mass. Boot Camp) decreased by 87 inmates from the first day of the second quarter to the last day of the quarter. At the end of the quarter, the DOC operated with 10,135 inmates in the system, and the average daily population was 10,194 with a design capacity of 8,130. Thus, the DOC operated at 125 percent of design capacity.

Population in DOC Facilities, April 1, 1999 to June 30, 1999					
Custody Level/ Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Custody Level 6					
Cedar Junction	560	565	551	633	88%
SBCC	772	751	812	1,024	75%
Framingham-ATU	133	135	149	64	208%
Custody Level 5					
OCCC	730	735	707	488	150%
Custody Level 4					
Concord	1,320	1,349	1,300	614	215%
Framingham	488	508	470	388	126%
Norfolk	1,492	1,492	1,486	1,084	138%
NCCI	962	966	964	568	169%
SECC	312	305	310	456	68%
Bay State	294	295	290	266	111%
Mass. Boot Camp	78	66	80	128	61%
Shirley-Medium	1,097	1,095	1,084	720	152%
*Bridgewater SDPTC	350	350	349	345	101%
Sub-Total	8,588	8,612	8,552	6,778	127%
Custody Level 3					
Plymouth	183	186	175	151	121%
NECC	230	246	212	150	153%
SECC-Minimum	98	97	100	100	98%
Shirley-Minimum	319	315	323	403	79%
Pondville	187	184	184	100	187%
Custody Level 3/2					
Lancaster-Male	122	124	120	94	130%
Lancaster-Female	59	60	61	59	100%
SMCC	194	189	194	125	155%
Sub-Total	1,392	1,401	1,369	1,182	118%
Custody Level 2					
Boston State	96	97	97	55	175%
Park Drive	50	50	49	50	100%
Hodder House	27	21	33	35	77%
Custody Level 1					
Charlotte	13	14	13	15	87%
Houston House	11	9	12	15	73%
PPREP	17	18	10	n.a	n.a
Sub-Total	214	209	214	170	126%
Total	10,194	10,222	10,135	8,130	125%
Bridgewater SH	352	351	359	227	155%
Bridgewater SDPTC	176	176	175	216	81%
Bridgewater AC	101	108	107	214	47%
Longwood TC	136	132	145	125	109%
Sub-Total	765	767	786	782	98%
Grand Total	10,959	10,989	10,921	8,912	123%
Houses of Correction	570	592	569	n.a.	n.a.
Federal Prisons	23	23	23	n.a.	n.a.
Inter-State Contract	249	248	249	n.a.	n.a.

(* See Technical Notes)

Table 2 provides the DOC figures for the previous twelve months - i.e., for the period April 1, 1998 to March 31, 1999. These figures indicate that the DOC population increased by 132, or 1 percent, over this twelve month period (excluding Bridgewater SH, SDPTC, AC, Longwood TC, and county inmates at the Mass. Boot Camp), from 10,135 in April, 1998 to 10,221 in March, 1999.

Population in DOC Facilities, April 1, 1998 to March 31, 1999					
Custody Level/ Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Custody Level 6					
Cedar Junction	646	793	567	633	102%
*SBCC	314	n.a	755	1,024	31%
Framingham-ATU	111	103	127	64	173%
Custody Level 5					
OCCC	727	704	734	488	149%
Custody Level 4					
Concord	1,352	1,377	1,358	614	220%
Framingham	517	486	511	388	133%
Norfolk	1,495	1,513	1,490	1,084	138%
NCCI	947	934	967	568	167%
SECC	598	804	306	456	131%
Bay State	294	296	294	266	111%
Mass. Boot Camp	100	117	72	128	87%
Shirley-Medium	1,097	1,098	1,091	720	152%
*Bridgewater SDPTC	349	346	350	345	101%
Sub-Total	8,547	8,571	8,622	6,778	126%
Custody Level 3					
Plymouth	173	180	185	151	115%
NECC	223	216	248	150	149%
SECC-Minimum	93	92	93	100	93%
Shirley-Minimum	319	326	312	403	79%
Pondville	179	170	182	100	179%
Custody Level 3/2					
Lancaster-Male	120	122	124	94	128%
Lancaster-Female	58	54	60	59	98%
SMCC	194	200	189	125	155%
Sub-Total	1,359	1,360	1,393	1,182	115%
Custody Level 2					
Boston State	95	93	97	55	173%
Park Drive	49	50	49	50	98%
Hodder House	26	27	21	35	74%
Custody Level 1					
Charlotte	7	11	14	15	47%
Houston House	10	11	8	15	67%
PPREP	12	12	17	n.a	n.a
Sub-Total	199	204	206	170	117%
Total	10,105	10,135	10,221	8,130	124%
Bridgewater SH	351	358	352	227	155%
Bridgewater SDPTC	181	187	176	216	84%
Bridgewater AC	96	94	107	214	45%
Longwood TC	135	132	133	125	108%
Sub-Total	763	771	768	782	98%
Grand Total	10,868	10,906	10,989	8,912	122%
Houses of Correction	684	726	591	n.a	n.a
Federal Prisons	24	26	23	n.a	n.a
Inter-State Contract	316	363	248	n.a	n.a

(* See Technical Notes)

Table 3 presents the county figures for the second quarter of 1999. The county population decreased by 177 inmates from the first day of the second quarter to the last day of the quarter. At the end of the quarter, the county system operated with 12,114 inmates, with an average daily population of 12,167 in facilities with a total design capacity of 8,356. Thus, the county system operated at 146 percent of design capacity.

Population in County Correctional Facilities by County, April 1, 1999 to June 30, 1999					
Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Barnstable	251	263	252	110	228%
Berkshire	222	227	211	116	191%
Bristol	1,082	1,071	1,072	666	162%
Dukes	30	37	26	19	158%
Essex	1,276	1,282	1,273	635	201%
Franklin	149	149	145	63	237%
Hampden	1,734	1,707	1,725	1,303	133%
Hampshire	208	211	230	248	84%
Middlesex	1,326	1,378	1,365	1,035	128%
Norfolk	617	624	597	379	163%
Plymouth	1,299	1,354	1,266	1,140	114%
Suffolk	2,513	2,554	2,445	1,599	157%
Worcester	1,262	1,259	1,307	790	160%
Longwood TC	136	132	145	125	109%
Mass. Boot Camp	62	43	55	128	48%
Total	12,167	12,291	12,114	8,356	146%

Table 4 presents the county figures for the second quarter of 1999. The following table presents a breakdown of specific counties, by facility.

Population in County Correctional Facilities by Facility, April 1, 1999 to June 30, 1999					
Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
<u>Bristol County</u>					
Bristol Ash Street	150	134	142	206	73%
Bristol Dartmouth	753	768	760	304	248%
Bristol DRNCAC	93	97	86	100	93%
Bristol Pre-Release	86	72	84	56	154%
<u>Essex County</u>					
Essex Middleton	1,054	1,074	1,010	500	211%
Essex LCAC	222	208	263	135	164%
<u>Hampden County</u>					
Hampden	1,597	1,569	1,591	1,178	136%
Hampden-OUI	137	138	134	125	110%
<u>Middlesex County</u>					
Middlesex Cambridge	245	256	265	161	152%
Middlesex Billerica	1,081	1,122	1,100	874	124%
<u>Norfolk County</u>					
Norfolk Dedham	510	515	502	302	169%
Norfolk Braintree	34	32	29	52	65%
Norfolk Contract	73	77	66	25	292%
<u>Suffolk County</u>					
Suffolk Nashua Street	629	636	624	453	139%
Suffolk South Bay	1,884	1,918	1,821	1,146	164%


Table 5 presents the county figures for the previous twelve months. These figures indicate that the county population decreased by 254 inmates, or minus 2 percent, over this twelve-month period, from 12,552 in April, 1998, to 12,298 in March, 1999.

Population in County Correctional Facilities by County, April 1, 1998 to March 31, 1999					
Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Barnstable	254	246	260	110	231%
Berkshire	237	226	222	116	204%
Bristol	1,108	1,218	1,071	666	166%
Dukes	30	21	39	19	158%
Essex	1,320	1,388	1,284	635	208%
Franklin	143	149	150	63	227%
Hampden	1,821	1,809	1,707	1,303	140%
Hampshire	237	245	215	248	96%
Middlesex	1,421	1,422	1,373	1,035	137%
Norfolk	630	631	624	379	166%
Plymouth	1,333	1,162	1,354	1,140	117%
Suffolk	2,542	2,562	2,554	1,599	159%
Worcester	1,284	1,284	1,266	790	163%
Longwood TC	135	132	133	125	108%
Mass. Boot Camp	48	57	46	128	38%
Total	12,543	12,552	12,298	8,356	150%

Table 6 presents the county figures for the previous twelve months. The following table presents a breakdown of specific counties, by facility.


Population in County Correctional Facilities by Facility, April 1, 1998 to March 31, 1999					
Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
<u>Bristol County</u>					
Bristol Ash Street	183	213	139	206	89%
Bristol Dartmouth	744	796	773	304	245%
Bristol DRNCAC	97	98	92	100	97%
Bristol Pre-Release	84	111	67	56	150%
<u>Essex County</u>					
Essex Middleton	1,095	1,135	1,076	500	219%
Essex LCAC	225	253	208	135	167%
<u>Hampden County</u>					
Hampden	1,681	1,670	1,569	1,178	143%
Hampden-OUI	140	139	138	125	112%
<u>Middlesex County</u>					
Middlesex Cambridge	263	255	251	161	163%
Middlesex Billerica	1,158	1,167	1,122	874	132%
<u>Norfolk County</u>					
Norfolk Dedham	513	501	515	302	170%
Norfolk Braintree	41	45	34	52	79%
Norfolk Contract	76	85	75	25	304%
<u>Suffolk County</u>					
Suffolk Nashua Street	645	702	633	453	142%
Suffolk South Bay	1,897	1,860	1,921	1,146	166%

Figure 1.
DOC Sentenced Population, Second Quarters of 1998 and 1999



The graph above compares the DOC sentenced population for the second quarter in 1998 to that in 1999, by month. For April, 1999 the DOC population increased by 102 inmates (1%) compared with the same month of 1998; for May, the population increased by 82 inmates (1%) ; and for June, the population decreased by 12 inmates.

Figure 2.
HOC Population, Second Quarters of 1998 and 1999




The graph above compares the HOC population for the second quarter in 1998 to that in 1999, by month. For April, 1999 the HOC population decreased by 301 inmates (-2%) compared with the same month of 1998; for May, the population decreased by 306 inmates (-2%) ; and for June, the population decreased by 361 inmates, or minus 3 percent.

Note: Data for Figures 1 and 2 were taken from the end of the month daily count sheet compiled by the Classification Division.

Table 7 provides statistics on new, criminally sentenced court commitments to the DOC for the second quarters of 1998 and 1999, by sex. Overall, there was a decrease of 90 new court commitments, or minus 6 percent for 1999 in comparison with the number of new court commitments in 1998, from 1,452 to 1,362. Male commitments for 1999 decreased by 80, or minus 8 percent from 1998. Female commitments during the second quarter of 1999 decreased by 10, or minus 2 percent compared to the number of commitments for the same time period in 1998.

Quarterly DOC New Court Commitment by Sex			
	1998	1999	Difference
Males			
First Quarter	517	478	-8%
Second Quarter	458	417	-9%
Sub -Total	975	895	-8%
Females			
First Quarter	238	242	2%
Second Quarter	239	225	-6%
Sub -Total	477	467	-2%
Total	1,452	1,362	-6%

Figure 3 provides a graphical representation of the number of new, criminally sentenced court commitments to the DOC during the second quarters of 1998 and 1999, by sex.



Note: Data for Table 7 and Figure 3 were obtained from the Inmate Tracking database maintained by the DOC.